Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

June 29, 1977

Craig Fields
Program Manager
Cybernetics Technology Office
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dear Craig:

Sorry for my delay in getting through the Wilbur Franklin manuscript; I had hoped to get to it much before now.

I'm really not to sure what to make of it since it is not that clear what is being sought. I presume that he is seeking funding for continued research along the lines he describes in his paper.

Merely reading the paper itself, Franklin appears manifestly reasonable and cautious. Clearly, he does report some negative results. However, more careful reading of the paper strongly reinforces suspicions that I have received about his biases and competencies (especially from a recent phone conversation with him in which I was surprised to find him quite credulous).

His biases show in small ways: Misreference to "carefully controlled conditions" (p.1); his stress on the absence of articles in physics journals (as though physical reports in psychical research journals somehow are less legitimating); reference to "very few sets" of (p.5) "definitive" repeatable experiments (when skeptics would argue that none such exist), using adjectives like "purportedly" (p.6) to describe magicians' natural replications of psychic effects; and refering to physicists (presumably like himself) as being "fully cognizant of the possible distortions to reality that might effect the observations and analysis" (p.7); and similar comments all show his lack of skepticism. He points out that some of the paranormal reports indicate "a degree of credibility in some of the experiments at least as high as that of some of the physics literature" (p. 8) which makes it clear that he does not understand that extraordinary reports need more rigorous controls and caution than mere ordinary reports found in the physics literature.

I was particularly struck by his reference (p.9) that "It is important to note, in attempts at implementation, the historical inefficacy of substantive financial reward to motivate subjects to perform carefully scrutinized scientific experiments." Yet he follows this with "Scientists, on the other hand, require adequate funding, which has seldom been available, in order to perform definitive experiments

EMU
Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

in this difficult field." Not only are both statements erroneous, they are even a bit contradictory. Many fraudulent attempts have been made by subjects seeking the rewards for successfully monitored psi production. Financial rewards have thus elicited mucy motivation from subjects: to commit fraud. His implication that "adequate funding" has not been available for scientists in the past is also dubious considering the great amounts of money already spent by scientists in this area. In any case, it is quite unclear what greater funding would promote giving it to the scientists if it has not acted to produce psi in the subjects! It seems most likely to me that greater funding is at least equally likely to produce fraud among the scientists.(In fact, according to the recent poll on fraud in science in New Scientist, the physicists were rated as having the highest frequency of data fudging!)

Since I am not a physicist, I am not that knowledgeable about some of the experimental techniques he describes. My comments here must be superficial. In his description of many of these, Franklin again seems to show some biases in his reporting. His reports on the studies in Panati's THE GLLER PAPERS make this obvious enough when one compares them to the recent debunking reviews by Ray Hyman and Martin Gardner and Christopher Evans. His reference to Taylor and Hasted, et al., as having conducted "observations of a reasonably definitive nature" (p.14) is just plain silly to anyone familiar with the works and their critiques.

Two other points need special mention. Reading the paper, one might get the impression that the subjects Franklin used were students at Kent State University. His subject "UG" is almost certainly Uri Geller, someone quite capable of fooling Franklin and with a reputation for past chicanery. Possibly more critical is the fact that the metallurgical analysis of the ring supposedly paranormally bent --as reported positively here by Franklin-- has since been revealed by Franklin as having been in error (confirmed to me in our phone conversation). I wonder if Franklin has since informed you of this error (since I presume this paper was written before he discovered the mistake).

Since Franklin grants that "None of these reports except for the work of Schmidt can be considered as definitive" (p.58), I presume his main case rests on Schmidt's work. I am familiar with Schmidt's work only via Franklin's description, and that leaves much to be desired. First of all, I would question the true randomness of the generator used, but even assuming that, the study sounds dubious. Franklin refers to volition having an effect "in either a positive or negative manner," which I presume refers to subjects' guessing wrong as well as right. This concept of "negative psi" has been severely criticized by past skeptics towards ESP experiments. After claiming the case is made for volitional effects, Franklin notes that predictions were also paranormally produced with similar statistical significance. Since prediction does not involve a volitional effect, this should have led him to question the effects of the volitional experiment. It would seem to me that one could see what correlations existed between two of the "random generators" used by Schmidt to empirically test if for randomness rather than merely presume randomness. In any case, the "numerous careful tests, checked for possible recording errors, nonrandomness of the generated signal, fraud on the part of the subjects" *claimed* to have been adequately conducted by Schmidt (according to Franklin) does not make these checks truly so. And, even if done as desdribed by Franklin, the study has not been replicated by skeptics and thus is hardly the *definitive* study Franklin claims.

It seems to me in the final analysis that three questions emerge. (1) Should such further studies by physicists be done? (2) What are the implications of such studies' possible positive results? And (3) who should be the ones supported to do such work?

Re (1) I certainly would encourage such study by physicists, as by other scientists. But I see no reason for thinking that physicists would somehow be more objective. I also think that any such work by physicists should be done in careful collaboration with a psychologist and consultation with knowledgeable magicians.

Re (2) I would be most cautious about interpretation of any positive results. Franklin clearly wants to leap to conclusions. Since,as Franklin acknowledges, many seemingly paranormal results are caused by little-known natural causes, this should be the *major research presumption*. Thus, if we get a paranormal effect,we should be excited because it may lead us to understand a little-known natural cause. Paranormal investigations lead to new normal findings. These new normal cause discoveries are worth while in themselves since they contribute to our general knowledge and future methodology. When we discovered that Kirlian effects are due to moisture rather than a psychic aura, that should not have been viewed merely as a debunking effort but as telling us something about volitional effects on moisture production. Franklin is clearly too eager to jump towards massive theoretical changes in physics based on small anomalies. This is clear from a number of statements. On the one hand, he wants to emphasize that "No effects were obtained in the experiments which were *definitely* outside the realm of known physics" (p.i), yet he then examines new theories which "involve obvious violations of known physical laws" (p.53) to possibly account for the alleged anomalies.

Re (3) I would clearly stress that I think Franklin is not the one to conduct future replications of the work he describes. In the first place, even if his conclusions were correct about his own work, it would be necessary for such work to be replicated by those with no vested interest in the results. In the second place, Franklin's own biases are plain. I think that his lack of objectivity is most obvious in his discussion (p.44) of his discussion of hypnosis and his claiming to see"UG" bend metallic objects "at short range and in full view...with no apparent force...seemingly automatically while not being touched by anyone." He obviously thinks that the only way he could have been thus fooled would have been through hypnosis! My impression of Franklin is that he is an honest but incredibly gullible investigator. He exhibits not only naivete but arrogance in thinking he can not be easily fooled; so much so that he does not feel it necessary to (a) question seriously his own observations, (b) question observations of others, especially fellow physicists (from Crookes to Puthoff), or (c) seek the counsel of a professional deceptionist (magician).

I hope my comments prove of some usefulness to you.

Sincerely,

Marcello

Marcello Truzzi

P.S. I am retaining the copy of the manuscript (a) in case you want me to refer to it again for further comment, and (b) for my own records. Let me know should you want it back.

DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY
1400 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

May 31, 1977

Dr. Marcello Truzzi
Chairman, Department of
Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Marcello:

Will you critique this article for me. I would like to hear your views in about a month if that is convenient. Thank you very much.

Best wishes,

Craig Fields
Program Manager
Cybernetics Technology Office

Enclosure

See checked items for work in teleneural physics.

WILBUR M. FRANKLIN

RESUME

Present Position: Professor and Chairman, Graduate Student Committee, Department of Physics, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44242

Personal Data:

Address: 5876 Horning Road, Kent, Ohio 44240
Telephone: 216-678-0153 (home); 216-672-2596 (office)
Birthdate: 28 February 1933
Marital Status: Married, four children
Social Security Number: 116-24-7926

Education:

1964 Ph.D., Syracuse University
1961 M.S., Yale University
1957 B.S., Case Western Reserve University
1954 B.A., The College of Wooster

Professional Career:

1976-present	Professor, Graduate Student Committee
1969-1976	Associate Professor, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, Full member of Graduate Faculty
1966-1969	Assistant Professor, Kent State University Kent, Ohio, Full member of Graduate Faculty
1964-1966	Senior Scientist, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
1961-1964	Research Assistant, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York
1960-1961	Engineer, General Electric Semiconductor Products Div.
1959-1960	Kaiser Aluminum Fellow, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
1957-1959	Engineer, Sikorsky Aircraft Co.

Professional Societies:

American Physical Society; Sigma Xi; Sigma Pi Sigma; American Association of University Professors; United Faculty Professional Association

✓ **Summer Activities:**

1975,76	Half-time teaching; half-time on Research Corporation & Parapsychology Foundation Grants in teleneural physics.

Tests for effects of volition on materials and experimental apparatus*

Wilbur Franklin, Physics Department, Kent State
University, Kent, Ohio 44242

The results of a number of diverse experiments and a critical review of the literature pertaining to the question of possible effects of volition on matter and experimental equipment, together with a brief review of theoretical approaches to the field, are given. Experiments were performed with human subjects some of whom had reportedly obtained results of a paranormal nature in tests for effects of volition done in other laboratories. Some of these experiments done in other laboratories were repeated under carefully controlled conditions. A critical analysis of the experimental studies for possible effects of volition on materials and equipment is made.

No effects were obtained in the experiments which were definitely outside the realm of known physics or physical effects. In three experiments, out of more than 15 performed, results were obtained which were significantly different from the controls. These experiments involved tests for possible effects of volition on the infrared spectra of sealed samples of water and attempts at deflection of a cantilever

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Jan. 23, 1978

Ms. Judith P. Mobley
Project Manager
Essex Corporation
201 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Ms. Mobley:

Enclosed is my final invoice re my DARPA grant cancelled on December 14th. Sorry for my delay in getting this in but I had problems getting a copy of the October phone bill. This is my last billing on the grant and covers over 4 months of accumulated expenses.

I trust it is all in proper order.

I will be getting my report to your office (my first semiannual letter report Craig Fields requested) in the next few weeks.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Marcello Truzzi

Marcello Truzzi
Professor & Dept. Head

EMU
Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

PS Form 3811, Apr. 1977

RETURN RECEIPT, REGISTERED, INSURED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

● SENDER: Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
Add your address in the "RETURN TO" space on reverse.

1. The following service is requested (check one).
   - ☐ Show to whom and date delivered. . . . . ____¢
   - ☒ Show to whom, date, and address of delivery. . ____¢
   - ☐ RESTRICTED DELIVERY
     Show to whom and date delivered. . . . . ____¢
   - ☐ RESTRICTED DELIVERY
     Show to whom, date, and address of delivery. $____
   - (CONSULT POSTMASTER FOR FEES)

2. ARTICLE ADDRESSED TO:
Dr. Craig Fields
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington Va 22209

3. ARTICLE DESCRIPTION:

REGISTERED NO.	CERTIFIED NO.	INSURED NO.
	673361	

(Always obtain signature of addressee or agent)

I have received the article described above.
SIGNATURE ☐ Addressee ☑ Authorized agent

4.
DATE OF DELIVERY
6/14/78

POSTMARK
ARLINGTON, VA.
JUN 14 1978
ROSSLYN STA.

5. ADDRESS (Complete only if requested)

6. UNABLE TO DELIVER BECAUSE:

CLERK'S INITIALS

☆GPO: 1977—0—249-595

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

VIRGINIA VA 220
PM
JUN
1978

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE
USE TO AVOID PAYMENT
OF POSTAGE, $300

U.S.MAIL

SENDER INSTRUCTIONS

Print your name, address, and ZIP CODE in the space below.

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3 on the reverse.
- Moisten gummed ends and attach to front of article if space permits. Otherwise affix to back of article.
- Endorse article "Return Receipt Requested" adjacent to number.

RETURN TO

Truzzi
(Name of Sender)

Soc / E.M.U.
(Street or P.O. Box)

Ypsi Mi 48197
(City, State, and ZIP Code)

ESSEX

October 5, 1977

Dr. Marcello Truzzi
Chairman, Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Truzzi:

During March of this past year you will recall participating in a review and assessment of new technology in the area of remote viewing for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (Dr. Craig Fields) under the Essex contract.

The Essex Corporation requires the submission of a final report for every task initiated and completed under our contract. Therefore, we appreciate receipt of a one-page summary of your presentation or remarks by the end of this month.

We appreciate your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Judith P. Mobley

Judith P. Mobley
Project Manager

ESSEX CORPORATION • 201 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 • (703) 548-4500

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

October 10, 1977

Judith P. Mobley
Project Manager
Essex Corporation
201 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Ms. Mobley:

Enclosed is a copy of the Final Report you requested re my participation in last March's conference with Craig Fields to assess the remote viewing experiments conducted as SRI. I hope this meets your requirements. Unfortunately, I do not seem to be able to find out from my records exactly what day in March this took place, but I presume you can add this (if necessary) from your records.

Sincerely,

Marcello Truzzi

Marcello Truzzi
Professor & Dept. Head

EMU
Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

FINAL REPORT

To: Essex Corporation/DARPA Date: October 10, 1977

From: Marcello Truzzi, Ph.D.
Dept. of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Re: March 1977 meeting with DARPA and Dr. Craig Fields to assess remote viewing experiment claims

A general discussion followed a series of presentations made by Dr. Ray Hyman, Dr. Persi Diaconis and myself evaluating the research effects claimed by Dr. Harold Puthoff and Mr. Russell Targ at the Stanford Research Institute on what they have called "remote viewing."

I concentrated on their works as published in several journals and particularly in their book Mind Reach. Puthoff and Targ claimed that they had produced completely replicable and completely satisfactory experiments producing telepathic and clairvoyant phenomena. They claimed that (1) this was established in carefully controlled experiments that precluded fraud, (2) these studies were done by neutral scientists, and (3) these results were not explainable in other ways. In my discussion, I tried to show that (1) the experiments were extremely sloppy and not at all fully controlled and were sometimes a failure, (2) the experimenters and their subjects were hardly neutral since they had strong ties with the Scientology movement which includes remote viewing as part of its theology, and (3) alternative explanations including both chance and fraud were possible to explain the results claimed. I further pointed out that (1) replications by skeptical others had produced negative results, (2) there were reasons to question the competence of these experimenters to carry out carefully controlled unbiased studies in this area, and (3) if replications of such studies were to be funded by the DARPA or other goverment agencies, such funds should go to totally independent investigators, preferably skeptical towards such results since Puthoff and Targ claim that their results are replicable by skeptics (unlike the claims of many parapsychologists for their own results). Thus, I strongly urged against extending funding to SRI to conduct more remote viewing experiments.

The discussions following our presentations dealt with many of the particulars in these experiments and also sought to clarify the facts surrounding many alleged psi phenomena produced by Puthoff and Targ's early reports on work with the alleged psychic Uri Geller. The general conclusions which I stressed was the lack of solid evidence for any of the purported paranormal effects claimed.

ESSEX

April 5, 1977

Dr. Marcello Truzzi
Chairman, Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Truzzi:

This letter authorizes you to incur costs within the research effort you intend to conduct for ARPA Contract MDA 903-75-C-0227.

The Essex Corporation agrees to pay you up to $3,000 for two (2) semi-annual reviews of parapsychology literature on submission of invoices covering the effort involved. Such documentation is for the benefit of the government auditors who review our billings to ARPA.

To aid you in submitting requests to us, we have detailed an invoice form for you to use. Filling in the blank spaces and forwarding the invoice to us is all that is required. You may find it convenient to use this form, but any method to detail your expenses with supporting documentation will undoubtedly be satisfactory to us.

If you have any questions at all, please feel free to contact Mrs. Judith Mobley or me.

We appreciate the opportunity of working with you on this ARPA program. We hope that you will find this relationship satisfactory and rewarding.

Sincerely,

ESSEX CORPORATION

Thomas B. Malone, PH.D.
Vice President and
Technical Director

TBM:crh

ESSEX CORPORATION • 201 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 • (703) 548-4500

ESSEX

May 25, 1977

Dr. Marcello Truzzi
Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Truzzi:

You should be receiving payment on your invoice in a few days.

Concerning your questions to Dr. Malone about travel and accommodation reimbursements: you will receive $15.00 per diem for food (exclusive of room and board) and reimbursement for "adequate" accommodations. You will also be reimbursed at $.15 per mile for personal car usage to anywhere in the United States, including Canada.

Please feel free to write me anytime you have any questions or problems.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Judith Paris Mobley

Judith P. Mobley
Project Manager

JPM:jp

ESSEX CORPORATION • 201 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 • (703) 548-4500

THE ZETETIC

Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Published by The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal

Editor: Marcello Truzzi

May 17, 1977

Dr. Thomas B. Malone
Vice-President and Technical Director
Essex Corporation
201 North Fairfax Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Dr. Malone:

Enclosed is my invoice re my grant for reimbursement for some phone calls, xeroxing and book purchases. Trust this is in order.

I need a bit of information about travel parameters. As I understand it, I am allowed $44 per day for "room and board" plus transportation costs. Is this correct, and do I simply use the same invoice form for this as the one I enclose now? My second question concerns transportation. Can I take my car at so-much per mile? If so, how much per mile? I am thinking of taking trips to a couple of places by car including Washington, D.C., and Toronto. This would enable me in the case of D.C. to stop at a couple of relevant institutions en route plus give me transportation once there. I presume that would be all right. Though I presume I can not use my grant to go abroad (e.g., the University of London), am I correct in presuming I can go to Canada (e.g., Toronto)? I would think so, but thought I should be sure first. There is a lot of parapsychological activity in Toronto and it is close enough to drive easily.

Sorry to bother you re these trivialities, but I am unfamiliar with the guidelines.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Marcello Truzzi

Marcello Truzzi

P.S. Please do not include my university address on my check or I will have trouble cashing it. Thanks.

(313) 487-0184

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

July 27, 1977

Dr. Thomas B. Malone
Vice-President and Technical Director
Essex Corporation
201 North Fairfax St.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Dr. Malone:

Enclosed is my invoice re my grant for reimbursement for phone calls, trips, etc. I trust the vouchers, etc. are in order for the $407.23 requested.

I trust my previous (July 1, 1977) reimbursement voucher, etc., is in processing since (a) I have not received that $171.40 yet and (b) did not get any acknowledgement of receipt of that voucher, etc. As with the first voucher, I presume reimbursement takes about 6 weeks. But I thought I might mention this just in case you somehow did not get my July 1 request. You need not reply if all is well.

I will send this letter to you with a "return receipt" request so you won't have to bother answering to let me know you got this voucher. Thanks.

Best wishes,

Marcello Truzzi

Marcello Truzzi
Professor

EMU
Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

Sean Harribance
H. Richard Nelf
THIS MAN KNOWS YOU. San Antonio: Naylor Co., 1976.

intro by Rhine
H

~~Dan~~ Markowitz
Joseph

Research and Development
CIA
Washington, D. C.

(703) 351-3458

"The Sociology of Parapsychology: A study of Scientific Outsiders"

Bill Roll

Psychical Research Foundation

poltergeist

Trinidad

stew split-off

Durham

psychical research

foundation — charlottesville

(death-survival)

good card guessing

xerox
money
re
survival

Barry Poss

political friend
of President of
Trinidad

Sex !!

2 beef burrito
4 taco

sean
Harribance
1968-70 article
JASPR

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Jan. 1, 1976

Craig Fields, Program Manager
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Va. 22209

Dear Craig:

I tried to call you yesterday but apparently your office was closed. I also tried to call you at what I was given as your home number, but you apparently weren't in. So, I am sorry not to have reached you before the end of the month as intended. I should have realized government offices might be closed on the 31st. I trust this delay presents no great inconvenience. I had to wait until I heard from Ray in regard to the others.

We decided that there should only be three of us: Ray Hyman, Persi Diaconis, and myself. This should simplify things since it will not be necessary to get David Marks here from England.

Persi Diaconis is in the Statistics Department at Stanford University. He has first-hand knowledge of the SRI research, especially the Geller tests.

I suggest that you or your secretary call Ray and Persi and ascertain their best times for the meeting given your alternatives available. I can adjust my schedule to suit the others. If a choice exists for me, Friday is the best day and Wednesday is the worst. But I can arrange it for anytime that is best for the others. Since Persi and Ray have to come from the West Coast, their schedules will probably be more complicated than mine.

If you haven't seen it, let me call your attention to the article on the SRI research in the current New York magazine. [redacted] one of SRI's young futurologists he is predicting international psychic warfare for the 1980s! SRI seems to be getting into psychic matters more deeply all the time.

Best wishes,

d.c.: Persi Diaconis
Ray Hyman

Marcello Truzzi
Professor & Dept.Head

EMU
Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY
1400 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

ARPA

8 September 1976

Dr. Marcello Truizzi
Chairman, Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Truizzi:

I spoke with you about an informal workshop I am holding on credibility, argumentation, rhetoric and persuasion (CARP) as they pertain to deception. I am delighted that you are able to attend. All of the attendees have broad interests and experience, and I expect it to be an exciting, memorable meeting.

Some of the attendees have expertise in deception application, both detection and perpetration (including deception in science, magic, fraud, the military, big business, intelligence, the courtroom, the laboratory, advertising, international negotiations, crime, mime, the circus, and acting) while others are concerned with deception theory (information processing, decision-making and reasoning failure; deception and game theory; deception and non-verbal behavior; social psychology of deception and persuasion). For your information, a tentative list of attendees is enclosed.

Our schedule (to be forwarded later) will include (spirited) free discussion; short, informal talks; and demonstrations such as mime, non-verbal behavior, the polygraph, and the voice analyzer. In general, I would like to spend part of our first day on approaches to detecting deception, part of our second day on approaches to achieving credibility, and part of our third day on high-level structures and strategies of deception. I hope we will try to discern some fairly general principles common among deception incidents.

As you will recall, I am seriously considering a major new research program in this area. I am hoping that discussion at the meeting will include new ideas for good research projects we might support, as well as acquainting potential participants in such a program of ARPA's interests.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL
1776-1976

I promised to send you a letter containing the practical information about the meeting. It will take place November 3, 4, and 5 at the United Nations Plaza Hotel located at One United Nations Plaza (44th St. and 1st Ave.) New York City, New York (telephone number: 212/355-3400).

This is an elegant and architecturally interesting new hotel with remarkable views from the rooms, an indoor tennis court, pool, sauna, etc. There will be an informal cocktail party in the U Thant Room from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on November 2 and we will begin the workshop at 9:00 a.m. on November 3 in the U Thant Room.

Single rooms have been reserved for out-of-town attendees for the nights of November 2, 3, 4 and 5. If you want a larger room or a room for different nights for personal reasons, please contact Rosanne Marsi (telephone number: 212/355-3400, ext. 1018) at the hotel to change your reservations.

Science Applications, Inc. (SAI), an ARPA contractor, has been helping me to organize this workshop. They have arranged to directly pay the room bill for the nights they have reserved for all attendees staying at the hotel. They will mail prepaid airline tickets to all attendees flying to New York. Please contact Tod Hoster at SAI (telephone number: 703/527-7571) if you have any questions concerning the tickets. After the meeting attendees should submit expense statements for meals, taxis, tips, phone calls, etc. to SAI, 1911 North Fort Myer Drive, Suite 1200, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

If you have any problems please contact me at 202/694-1303 (office) or 202/667-2836 (home). Also, please mail the enclosed card to acknowledge receipt of this note. If you need any audio-visual equipment, please indicate on the card and I will make the arrangements.

I'll look forward to seeing you November 2 or 3 in New York. I am sure you will enjoy the meeting and New York City.

Sincerely,

Craig Fields
Program Manger
Cybernetics Technology Office

Enclosure

ATTENDEES

Marilyn J. Adams	Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc.	Cambridge, MA
Robert S. Andrews	U.S. Army Research Institute	Arlington, VA
Davis Bobrow	University of Maryland	College Park, MD
Michael E. Bongar	Herbert and Rosie	New York, NY
Steven J. Brams	New York University	New York, NY
Harold Burris-Meyer	Florida Atlantic University	Boca Raton, FL
Alan Collins	Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc.	Cambridge, MA
Paul Ekman	University of California	San Francisco, CA
Alison Fields	U.S. Army Research Institute	Arlington, VA
Craig Fields	ARPA/Cybernetics Technology	Arlington, VA
Baruch Fischhoff	Oregon Research Institute	Eugene, OR
Martin Gardner	Scientific American	New York, NY
Jack Gurin	Department of Defense	Ft. Meade, MD
Jeanne A. Halpin	Science Applications, Inc.	Arlington, VA
Raymond Hyman	University of Oregon	Eugene, OR
Edgar M. Johnson	U.S. Army Research Institute	Arlington, VA
Leon Kaplan	Opinion Research Corporation	Princeton, NJ
Elizabeth F. Loftus	University of Washington	Seattle, WA
Joseph Markowitz	U.S. Government	Washington, DC
Robert Meersman	University of Maryland	College Park, MD
Harold F. O'Neil, Jr	ARPA/Cybernetics Technology	Arlington, VA
Samuel M. Patten	U.S. Army (Retired)	Winchester, VA
James Randi	The Amazing Randi	Rumson, NJ
Michael G. Samet	Perceptronics, Inc.	Woodland Hills, CA
Virginia E. Schein	Yale University	New Haven, CT
Marcello Truizzi	Eastern Michigan University	Ypsilanti, MI
Robert S. Wyer, Jr.	University of Illinois	Champaign, IL
Robert A. Young	ARPA/Cybernetics Technology	Arlington, VA

Deception

Intentional manipulation to produce
X's misperception of Y.

Misperception of Fact
Relationship

Perceptual } misperception
cognitive
- Lying
- Distortion
- Misleadin-Misdirection

Michael Bongar
485 Broome St.
N.Y.C. 10013
(212) 925-3965

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEFENSE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY
1400 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22209

ARPA

November 17, 1976

Dr. Marcello Truzzi
Chairman, Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Marcello:

Thank you very much for attending our Deception Workshop in New York, and for giving such a fine talk. I enjoyed your presentation as well as your numerous comments throughout the meeting. We are definitely going to go ahead and fund something in the area of deception, but it is not exactly clear what we want to do. If you have any suggestions, I would be happy to hear them. Independently, we are now dedicated to using your committee to check out paranormal claims that are received by ARPA. We proposed this for the effort being suggested to a different part of ARPA by SRI. I think they decided to withdraw, but I am not yet certain. I will be in touch with you when something develops. Thank you again for coming to New York. I enjoyed meeting you and I hope that we can interact in the future.

Best wishes,

Craig Fields
Program Manager
Cybernetics Technology

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL
1776-1976

RONALD H. CORDOVER
730 DAKOTA TRAIL
FRANKLIN LAKES, N. J. 07417

November 23, 1976

Prof. Marcello Truzzi
Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Marcello:

It was a pleasure interacting with you at the ARPA conference on deception in New York. I enjoyed our conversations and hope that we have a chance to continue them.

Your committee's activities in the investigation of paranormal claims are particularly interesting to me and if your prejudices about physicists are not too strong, perhaps I could be of some help.

In any case, as we discussed, I would be pleased to try to be of assistance in the promotional area. My kind regards.

Sincerely,

Ron Cordover

P.S. I would appreciate your sending me a copy of the first issue of the Zetetic.

RHC/jef

ESSEX

December 15, 1977

Dr. Marcello Truzzi, Professor
Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Dear Dr. Truzzi:

We have appreciated your cooperation during the last year concerning your twice annual literature update of paranormal research having Department of Defense implications.

Due to a recent reallocation of DARPA's resources and program research and development, a decision has been made to discontinue present funding for your project.

Please be assured you will receive payment for whatever bills you have in hand relevant to previous work on your project.

Again, many thanks for your cooperation and assistance. Best wishes for a happy year.

Sincerely,

Judith P. Mobley

Judith Paris Mobley
Project Manager

ESSEX CORPORATION • 201 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 • (703) 548-4500

DECEPTION/CARP WORKSHOP ATTENDEES
(New York, New York; 3-5 November 1976)

Dr. Marilyn J. Adams (617) 491-1850
Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Mr. Robert S. Andrews (202) 694-4031
U.S. Army Research Institute
Commonwealth Building
1300 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Dr. Davis Bobrow (301) 454-3547
Professor and Chairman,
Department of Government & Politics
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Mr. Michael E. Bongar (212) 925-3965
485 Broome Street
New York, New York 10013

Dr. Steven J. Brams (212) 598-3278/3277
Department of Politics
New York University
25 Waverly Place
New York, New York 10003

Dr. Allan Collins (617) 491-1850
Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Dr. Ronald H. Cordover (201) 891-3065
730 Dakota Trail
Franklin Lakes, New Jersey 07417

Dr. Paul Ekman (415) 681-8080 x 208
University of California
401 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, California 94143

Mr. John Elko (301) 454-2541
Department of Speech/Dramatic Art
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. Alison F. Fields U.S. Army Research Institute Commonwealth Building 1300 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22209	(202) 694-3657
Dr. Craig I. Fields Cybernetics Technology Office Advanced Research Projects Agency 1400 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22209	(202) 694-1303
Dr. Baruch Fischhoff Decision Research 1201 Oak Street Eugene, Oregon 97401	(503) 485-2400
Mr. Martin Gardner 10 Euclid Avenue Hastings-on-Hudson, New York 10706	(914) 478-0842
Mr. Jack Gurin Director, National Security Agency 9800 Savage Road Ft. George G. Meade, Maryland	(301) 688-8147
Ms. Jeanne A. Halpin Science Applications, Inc. 1911 North Fort Myer Drive Suite 1200 Arlington, Virginia 22209	(703) 527-7571
Dr. Raymond Hyman Department of Psychology University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon 97403	(503) 686-4910
Dr. J.C.R. Licklider Project LCS/MIT, Room 218 545 Technology Square Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	(617) 253-7705
Dr. Elizabeth F. Loftus Department of Psychology University of Washington Seattle, Washington 98105	(206) 543-7184
Mr. Tom Marill Computer Corporation of America 575 Technology Square Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	(617) 491-3671

Dr. Joseph Markowitz 9514 Georgetown Pike Great Falls, Virginia 22026	(202) 965-0033
Dr. Raymond S. Nickerson Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. 50 Moulton Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138	(617) 491-1850
Mr. Samuel M. Patten RFD #1, Box 107 A9 Boyce, Virginia 22720	(703) 837-1103
Mr. James Randi 51 Lennox Avenue Rumson, New Jersey 07760	(201) 747-1168
Dr. Samuel C. Reed Opinion Research Corporation Princeton, New Jersey 08540	(609) 924-5900
Dr. Michael G. Samet Perceptronics, Inc. 6271 Variel Avenue Woodland Hills, California 91364	(213) 884-7470
Dr. Virginia E. Schein Yale University School of Organization and Management 1891 Yale Station New Haven, Connecticut 06520	(203) 436-1986
Mr. Oliver Selfridge Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc. 50 Moulton Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138	(617) 491-1850
Dr. Marcello Truzzi Chairman, Department of Sociology Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	(313) 487-0012
Lt. John Veraja C.O. Pickpocket & Confidence Squad One Police Plaza New York, New York 10038	(212) 374-6910

Mr. Gus Weiss (202) 456-6257
Assistant Director, Council
on Economic Policy
The White House
1600 Pensylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20012

Dr. Robert A. Young (202) 694-1303
Defense Advanced Research
Projects Agency
Cybernetics Technology Office
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

June 8, 1978

Dear Craig:

My abject apologies for being so very late in getting this report to you. I enclose two copies since you might want to send one to Ms. Mobley at Essex (I have not done so). In addition to many complications at my end, including some health difficulty, I have been going through a period of reassessment which delayed things (my reappraisal is reflected in the report). I now see things as far more complex than I did earlier. I remain a strong skeptic but my interactions with the Committee for SICOP led me to feel that there is also too much dogma and irresponsibility among the critics of parapsychology.

Not as part of the report, but for your own interest, I enclose a copy of ZETETIC SCHOLAR.

Again, my apologies for my long delay. I hope no damage has been done by it.

Sincerely,

Marcello Truzzi

Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

RPA
-75-C-027

eports
ance
been
s makes

most
ms re-
I"
ally
he other
ing
is is
is con-
sts but
even if
er
might
forest

be
ould
nking
psi exists if it does not is an unlikely threat, but thinking it does not exist if it does could allow disaster (if an enemy learned its use). In this important sense, the military and the parapsychologists approach psi (or at least rationally can approach psi research) with a somewhat different weighing of the burdens of proof than might be common among normal psychologists more interested in avoiding the typical Type I error.

Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

June 7, 1978

Dr. Craig Fields
Program Manger
Cybernetics Technology Office
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Final Report re ARPA
Contract MDA 903-75-C-027

Dear Dr. Fields:

The state of parapsychological research (at least in so far as reports are publicly available) has basically made little significant advance over the last several years. Though some startling claims have been made, failure to replicate such effects by non-interested parties makes them difficult if not impossible to assess.

There are two basic approaches to psi research. The first, the most common in psychology, is to insist that such extraordinary claims require exceptional proof since we might otherwise make a "Type I" error and think something unusual is happening when nothing really is. This is the conservative position taken by most skeptics. The other approach is concerned with the "Type II" error of thinking nothing unusual is happening when something important is going on. This is the approach taken by many, if not most parapsychologists. This concern with Type II error is not typically found among psychologists but is more typical of those dealing with medical research. Thus, even if the odds are small, a possible breakthrough in conquering cancer makes us concerned with not missing something important that might help. It is the old problem of either not seeing the trees for the forest or vice-versa.

From the standpoint of defense, concern with the Type II may be paramount. Thus, if psi exists it could be a terrible danger should the enemy learn to control it and get through our defenses. Thinking psi exists if it does not is an unlikely threat, but thinking it does not exist if it does could allow disaster (if an enemy learned its use). In this important sense, the military and the parapsychologists approach psi (or at least rationally can approach psi research) with a somewhat different weighing of the burdens of proof than might be common among normal psychologists more interested in avoiding the typical Type I error.

Department of Sociology
(313) 487-0012

In a specific sense, the parapsychologists have not been able to establish the existence of psi. But the presence of literally hundreds of experiments by seemingly competent researchers which claim to have resulted in positive psi effects (usually simply operationalized as significant non-chance guessing scores) certainly in itself indicates that something extraordinary (unexpected) is happening. The question is what ? Skeptics like myself would argue that methodological or other kinds of errors are more reasonable explanations than the presence of psi. But it must be admitted that this a presumption on the part of us skeptics and mainly is a result of our concern with avoiding a Type I error. In any case, the fact that something anomalous is happening is of scientific interest whether or not psi is the cause. It seems to me that support for properly conducted parapsychological research might lead to important and significant results other than proving psi since the alternatives to psi that produce these results also need to be better understood. Thus, careful work might result in a total reassessment of our assumptions about statistical distributions, experimenter effects, or whatever is the source of the something that is happening to produce the anomalous results in so very many psi studies.

The major public "breakthroughs" claimed during these recent years by psi researchers have been the work on remote viewing at Stanford Research Institute conducted by R. Targ and H. Puthoff and the attempts to "teach" psi learning through reinforcement techniques by C. T. Tart. Both of these public studies have many problems connected with them (evidenced by the critical reviews of the respective books by these researchers), but both represent something quite new on the scene. The SRI work is unusual in its claims that positive results are completely replicable (something almost certainly not true based on already existing studies that failed to replicate), and Tart's work is unusual in that he uses ordinary and even skeptical subjects. The SRI work is also unusual in that so much of the work has been government supported (including many unconfirmed reports of heavy CIA backing). My latest reports indicate that Dr. Tart will be working with Targ and Puthoff in 1978-79 when he takes a leave from his position at the University of California at Davis. Thus, it would appear that funding for psi research at SRI may even be expanding. Since the studies by Targ and Puthoff have been so seriously criticized by the skeptics, and Tart's own work has been heavily internally criticized by fellow parapsychologists' reviews, this support for their work seems a bit surprising.

Other work of course goes on in parapsychology. The work by C. Honorton is particularly worthy of mention as among the most rigorous and self-critical (though certainly not enough so to satisfy critics like James Randi). But the work by Targ & Puthoff and by Tart clearly stands out as the most promising work in so far as the general goal is to produce a replicable experiment that could be done with positive results even by skeptics.

At the same time that the parapsychologists have been busy, the opposition has been mounting its offensives. The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal has been actively publicizing itself and its concerns. However, recent actions by the Executive Council of the Committee for SICOP have acted to rather change the original character of that Committee. The journal put out by the Committe has changed its name from THE ZETETIC to THE SKEPTICAL INQUIRER. The Executive Council of the Committee voted to change the journal from a scholarly publication into a popular magazine. This resulted in the resignation of its editor (myself), and the new editor is Mr. Kendrick Frazier, former editor of SCIENCE NEWS. The magazine is still in its transition phase and is supposed to become a popular magazine for a general audience. One of the results of this change has been a concentration of the Committee's activities on the paranormal as presented in the popular media. This has resulted in the Committee's issuing several complaints to the FCC about television coverage. More important, it has led to the Committee's concentration upon the "popular paranormal," the media-centered claimants like Uri Geller and Jeane Dixon, rather than upon the serious parapsychological community's efforts. The practical effect of all this is that the Committee is unlikely to have much effect in gaining the cooperation of the serious parapsychological community in properly testing their claims. The parapsychologists now generally see the Committee as a kind of inquisition threatening their existence rather than as an open-minded but skeptical group of inquirer into the truth of psi claims.

The most recent development is the publication of ZETETIC SCHOLAR, a new journal I am putting out with a consulting editorial board of both prominent skeptics (some of whom, like Ray Hyman, Persi Diaconis and Martin Gardner are on the Committee for SICOP) along with what I view as prominent and basically serious claimants for the paranormal (like J. Allen Hynek, Charlest T. Tart and Michel Gauquelin). The ZETETIC SCHOLAR will seek to accomplish the original mission I envisioned as editor of the Committee's journal (THE ZETETIC), an attempt to rationally and scientifically examine the best evidence that the most responsible claimants of the paranormal have to offer. By including persons from both sides of these issues, a real dialogue may develop that will advance matters.

Any final assessment of parapsychological claims is, of course, impossible at this time. On the one hand, inquiry into the methods employed in the best studies seems to reveal important flaws. On the other hand, new studies, including claimed replications, keep coming forward.

In my estimation, the central problem has been inadequate communication and experimental procedures. Psi studies need to be conducted by skeptical investigators but not so much for the purpose of "debunking" past studies as to make methodological advances; that is, we need to find out what has been wrong with the psi experiments that worked out positively if no psi was present. Experiments need to be designed with alternative designs and programs that will lead us to greater understanding whether or not psi can be found. If the initial studies come out positively, we need to have follow-up studies in mind that will either refine our finding or give us the source of our error. Whether it be psi or error, we need to pin down what is happening. We need to be skeptical but constructively skeptical so that we will emerge with positive results as well as merely negative ones (when we fail to replicate some psi experiment).

Despite my pessimism about the existence of psi, it seems to me incontrovertible that something important is happening since the results we have been getting are not what would have been predicted. Even if we think the worst and find that fraud is rampant among parapsychologists, this would be something we definitely need to confirm for it would have serious implications for science far beyond parapsychology (for why should these scientists "fudge" their data that much more than scientists in other "high payoff, high risk" areas?).

Because of the importance of psi should it exist, not merely theoretically but practically (especially in terms of national security considerations), rationality demands some federal interest (and presumably funding) lest we make a Type II error that could prove highly consequential. But I would strongly counsel that such work be conducted by disinterested parties with merely normal scientific skepticism rather than by either the "True Believers" or "True Disbelievers," both of whom are likely to distort the significance of their findings. Given the relatively small funding involved in such studies and the importance of the results (one way or the other if my "constructive" approach is taken since any results will advance our knowledge in needed areas that could prove useful), I would urge continued interest in psi research on a moderate and responsible level. But the emphasis should be less on finding psi than upon understanding what is happening to produce the results some have interpreted as evidence of psi.

A final word might be said about the recent intrusion of natural scientists into areas normally the province of the parapsychologists. In particular, we have seen so-called para-physicists enter the arena. These are of two varieties. There are the theoreticians like E. H. Walker and John Taylor. These have tried to reformulate physics to accomodate psi evidence. In general, this is largely premature since little of this has led to developing new experiments that would help us better to reproduce psi experimentally. The second variety consists of those like the late Wilbur Franklin (Targ and Puthoff would be here grouped also) that seek to examine physical evidence of psi forces (especially PK). This second group seems to have been unable to produce any convincing results, and those thus far produced have generally been investigated and found erroneous. I think it would be fair to say that no real breakthroughs have emerged in this area. In general, in fact, the paraphysicists seem to know less about proper controls in psychological experiments than do the psychical researchers who have been busy in the area for the last 50 years.

Sincerely,

Marcello Truzzi

Marcello Truzzi, Ph. D.
Professor